



CONNECTICUT AFL-CIO

56 Town Line Road, Rocky Hill, CT 06067

Tel: 860-571-6191

Fax: 860-571-6190

437

Testimony of the Connecticut AFL-CIO before the Labor and Public Employees Committee

February 24th, 2015

Senator Winfield, Representative Tercyak and members of the Labor and Public Employees Committee,

I am Lori Pelletier and I serve as the Executive Secretary- Treasurer of the Connecticut AFL-CIO. I am here to testify on behalf of the 900 affiliated local unions who represent 200,000 working men and women from every city and town in our great state as follows:

On behalf of both union and non-union workers in this state the Connecticut AFL-CIO submits this testimony for your consideration. Since the 1980's worker protections have been diminishing. Income inequality today is at record levels and with the inaction in Washington there doesn't appear to be any relief in sight. From the underfunding of OSHA to delays in the confirmation of members of the NLRB safe guards for workers are not a priority and this is making a bad situation worse.

How does this relate to the proposed changes to the Fund? Well it demonstrates a pattern, a pattern of disadvantaging workers who as consumers drive our economic engine. For decades workers and their allies have fought for protections under the Fund. In the early 1990's the legislature enacted changes to worker eligibility with promises of fund solvency. The taxable wage base was raised to \$15,000.00 in 1999 and despite calls to include a regular adjustment to that amount nothing more has been done.

So here we are today in a similar situation as we were 20 years ago with the similar proposals to undermine the stability of our families who are in the midst of a crisis situation. Remember, employers have the ultimate power in that they control employees' income. So when a husband or wife loses their job through no fault of their own they need a safety net to protect their family.

Each of the "proposed" changes is punitive to the worker. Today's workforce has more women than men, is becoming more and more part time, so increasing the earning requirements or changing the formula hurts families. Initiating a one week waiting period or freezing the maximum benefit hurts our consumer driven economy. Too many workers today live paycheck to paycheck, so the waiting week proposed means for those workers that they will have no money to spend on rent, groceries, gas etc. I suppose they could get their landlord to agree to a week's free rent? Hardly.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER

Lori J. Pelletier

PRESIDENT

Salvatore Luciano

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

Melodie M. Peters

GENERAL VICE PRESIDENT

Thomas A. Wilkinson

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

David A. Roche

TRUSTEES

Mark A. Esplanosa

Jeffrey H. Matchett

Jean M. Morningstar

EXECUTIVE BOARD

John Altieri

Richard Benham

Karen Blanchard

Tammie Botelho

Beverley Brakeman

Wayne Burgess

Michael Calderon

Peter Carozza, Jr.

Peter Carroll

Carol Censki

Frank Cirillo

Everett Corey

Shellye Davis

Kenneth Delacruz

Michael Dennehy

Stephen Ferrucci III

Ronald Frost

Patrick Gaynor

Richard Golembiewski

William Henderson

Juan Hernandez

Keri Hoehne

Thursa Isaac

Clarke King

Charles LeConche

Laila Mandour

Bette Marafino

John McCarthv

Richard McCombs

Stephen McKeever

Ronald McLellan

Craig Metz

Anna Montalvo

Tiana Ocasio

Warren Pepicelli

Michael Petosa

Ronald Petronella

Robert Proto

Peter Reilly

Carmen Reyes

Michael Rosario

Kathleen Santiago

Patrena Smith

Barbara Smyth

Valerie Stewart

James Wallace, Jr.

Paul Wallace

PRESIDENT EMERITUS

John W. Olsen